



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1</b>	VERDICT FORM.....	1
<b>1.1</b>	QUESTION NO. 1—INFRINGEMENT .....	2
<b>1.2</b>	QUESTION NO. 2—MARKING.....	17
<b>1.3</b>	QUESTION NO. 3—REASONABLE ROYALTY .....	19
<b>1.4</b>	QUESTION NO. 4—WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT .....	20

**1 VERDICT FORM**

Based on the evidence admitted at trial and in accordance with the instructions as given by the Court, we, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions.

**1.1 QUESTION NO. 1—INFRINGEMENT<sup>2</sup>**

**QUESTION NO. 1**

**a. U.S. Patent No. 7,015,868 – Claim 26**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 26 of the ‘868 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 26 of the ‘868 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 26 of the ‘868 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 26 of the ‘868 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 26 of the ‘868 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 26 of the ‘868 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>2</sup> For the reasons set forth in their motion *in limine*, Defendants contend that no questions should be given to the jury regarding the doctrine of equivalents (DOE). The interrogatories included in this draft verdict form relating to infringement under the DOE are included only in the event this Court decides that Fractus should be permitted to submit this issue to the jury despite having not raised or argued it in any meaningful way during discovery.

**b. U.S. Patent No. 7,015,868 – Claim 35**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 35 of the '868 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 35 of the '868 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 35 of the '868 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 35 of the '868 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 35 of the '868 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 35 of the '868 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**c. U.S. Patent No. 7,123,208 – Claim 7**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 7 of the '208 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 7 of the '208 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 7 of the '208 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 7 of the '208 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 7 of the '208 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 7 of the '208 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**d. U.S. Patent No. 7,123,208 – Claim 12**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 12 of the '208 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 12 of the '208 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 12 of the '208 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 12 of the '208 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 12 of the '208 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 12 of the '208 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**e. U.S. Patent No. 7,397,431 – Claim 14**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 14 of the '431 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 14 of the '431 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 14 of the '431 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 14 of the '431 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 14 of the '431 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 14 of the '431 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.



**f. U.S. Patent No. 7,397,431 – Claim 30**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 30 of the '431 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 30 of the '431 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 30 of the '431 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 30 of the '431 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 30 of the '431 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 30 of the '431 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**g. U.S. Patent No. 7,394,432 – Claim 6**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 6 of the '432 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 6 of the '432 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 6 of the '432 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 6 of the '432 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 6 of the '432 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 6 of the '432 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**h. U.S. Patent No. 7,528,782 – Claim 6**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 6 of the '782 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 6 of the '782 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 6 of the '782 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 6 of the '782 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 6 of the '782 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 6 of the '782 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**i. U.S. Patent No. 7,528,782 – Claim 7**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 7 of the '782 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 7 of the '782 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 7 of the '782 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 7 of the '782 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 7 of the '782 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 7 of the '782 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**j. U.S. Patent No. 7,528,782 – Claim 8<sup>3</sup>**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 8 of the ‘782 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 8 of the ‘782 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 8 of the ‘782 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 8 of the ‘782 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 8 of the ‘782 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 8 of the ‘782 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>3</sup> Kyocera Wireless Corp. and Kyocera Communications, Inc. are not accused of infringing claim 8 of the ‘782 patent and accordingly do not request any questions regarding infringement of this claim.

**k. U.S. Patent No. 7,148,850 – Claim 22**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 22 of the ‘850 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 22 of the ‘850 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 22 of the ‘850 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 22 of the ‘850 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 22 of the ‘850 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 22 of the ‘850 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**I. U.S. Patent No. 7,148,850 – Claim 70**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 70 of the ‘850 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 70 of the ‘850 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 70 of the ‘850 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 70 of the ‘850 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 70 of the ‘850 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 70 of the ‘850 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

**m. U.S. Patent No. 7,202,822– Claim 8**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 8 of the ‘822 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 8 of the ‘822 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 8 of the ‘822 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 8 of the ‘822 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 8 of the ‘822 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 8 of the ‘822 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.



**n. U.S. Patent No 7,312,762 – Claim 21<sup>4</sup>**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 21 of the ‘762 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 21 of the ‘762 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 21 of the ‘762 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 21 of the ‘762 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 21 of the ‘762 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 21 of the ‘762 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>4</sup> Pantech Wireless, Inc. is not accused of infringing the ‘762 patent and accordingly do not request any questions regarding infringement of the ‘762 patent.

**o. U.S. Patent No. 7,411,556 – Claim 40<sup>5</sup>**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF1 infringes Claim 40 of the ‘556 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 literally infringe Claim 40 of the ‘556 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF1 infringe Claim 40 of the ‘556 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that DEF2 infringes Claim 40 of the ‘556 Patent either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents? \_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

If you answered YES to the question above:

(1) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 literally infringe Claim 40 of the ‘556 Patent: \_\_\_\_\_.

And,

(2) Please identify which of the product(s) of DEF2 infringe Claim 40 of the ‘556 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents: \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>5</sup> HTC Corporation and HTC America, Inc. are not accused of infringing the ‘556 patent and accordingly do not request any questions regarding infringement of the ‘556 patent.

**1.2 QUESTION NO. 2—MARKING<sup>6</sup>**

*Answer Question No. 2 only if you answered “Yes” to one or more of the subparts of Question No. 1 as to DEF1’s or DEF2’s accused products, finding that DEF1 and/or DEF2 infringed one or more of the claims of the patents in issue. Otherwise, do not answer Question No. 2.*

**QUESTION NO. 2**

Has Fractus proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more likely than not) that substantially all of the products it made, offered for sale, or sold under the patents in issue were marked, and that Fractus made reasonable efforts to ensure that its licensees who made, offered for sale, or sold products under the patents in issue marked substantially all of their products.

U.S. Patent No. 7,015,868                      ☐ Yes ☐ No

If YES, by what date was Fractus’s marking substantially consistent and continuous: \_\_\_\_\_.

U.S. Patent No. 7,123,208                      ☐ Yes ☐ No

If YES, by what date was Fractus’s marking substantially consistent and continuous: \_\_\_\_\_.

U.S. Patent No. 7,397,431                      ☐ Yes ☐ No

If YES, by what date was Fractus’s marking substantially consistent and continuous: \_\_\_\_\_.

U.S. Patent No. 7,394,432                      ☐ Yes ☐ No

If YES, by what date was Fractus’s marking substantially consistent and continuous: \_\_\_\_\_.

---

<sup>6</sup> HTC Corporation and HTC America, Inc. are not accused of infringing the ‘556 patent and accordingly do not request any questions regarding marking of the ‘556 patent.

U.S. Patent No. 7,148,850                      \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

If YES, by what date was Fractus's marking substantially consistent and continuous: \_\_\_\_\_.

U.S. Patent No. 7,202,822                      \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

If YES, by what date was Fractus's marking substantially consistent and continuous: \_\_\_\_\_.

U.S. Patent No. 7,411,556                      \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

If YES, by what date was Fractus's marking substantially consistent and continuous: \_\_\_\_\_.

U.S. Patent No. 7,312,762                      \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

If YES, by what date was Fractus's marking substantially consistent and continuous: \_\_\_\_\_.

**1.3 QUESTION NO. 3—REASONABLE ROYALTY**

*Answer Question No. 3A only if you answered “Yes” to one or more of the subparts of Question Nos. 1 as to DEF1’s accused products, finding that DEF1 infringed one or more of the claims of the patents in issue. Otherwise, do not answer Question No. 3A.*

**QUESTION NO. 3A**

What damages, stated in terms of a reasonable royalty, do you find Fractus has proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more probable than not) were suffered as a result of DEF1’s infringement as found by you in answer to Question No. 1?

1. Reasonable Per-Antenna Royalty: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Total Number of Infringing Units: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Total Royalty Owed by DEF1 \_\_\_\_\_

*Answer Question No. 3B only if you answered “Yes” to one or more of the subparts of Question No. 1 as to DEF2’s accused products, finding that DEF2 infringed one or more of the claims of the patents in issue. Otherwise, do not answer Question No. 3B.*

**QUESTION NO. 3B**

What damages, stated in terms of a reasonable royalty, do you find Fractus has proven by a preponderance of the evidence (in other words, that it is more probable than not) were suffered as a result of DEF2’s infringement as found by you in answer to Question No. 1?

1. Reasonable Per-Antenna Royalty: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Total Number of Infringing Units: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Total Royalty Owed by DEF2 \_\_\_\_\_

**1.4 QUESTION NO. 4—WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT<sup>7</sup>**

*Answer Question No. 4A only if you answered “Yes” to one or more of the subparts of Question No. 1 as to DEF1’s accused products, finding that DEF1 infringed one or more of the claims of the patents in issue. Otherwise, do not answer Question No. 4A.*

**QUESTION NO. 4A**

Do you find that the Plaintiff has proven by clear and convincing evidence (in other words, that it is highly probable) that DEF1’s infringement was willful?

Patent	Did DEF1 willfully infringe? (Answer “Yes” or “No” but only for patents where you found infringement)
868 Patent	
209 Patent	
431 Patent	
432 Patent	
782 Patent	
850 Patent	
822 Patent	
762 Patent	
556 Patent	

---

<sup>7</sup> HTC Corporation and HTC America, Inc. are not accused of willful infringement and accordingly do not request any questions regarding willfulness.

*Answer Question No. 4B only if you answered “Yes” to one or more of the subparts of Question No. 1 as to DEF2’s accused products, finding that DEF2 infringed one or more of the claims of the patents in issue. Otherwise, do not answer Question No. 4B.*

**QUESTION NO. 4B**

Do you find that the Plaintiff has proven by clear and convincing evidence (in other words, that it is highly probable) that DEF2’s infringement was willful?

Patent	Did DEF2 willfully infringe? (Answer “Yes” or “No” but only for patents where you found infringement)
868 Patent	
209 Patent	
431 Patent	
432 Patent	
782 Patent	
850 Patent	
822 Patent	
762 Patent	
556 Patent	

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Presiding Juror should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the marshal that you have reached a verdict. The Presiding Juror should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_ Presiding Juror